Pre-Taymiyan Scholars who declared Kufr and Shirk for attributing Divine Powers to the Creation such as Kun Fayakun or the knowledge of the Unseen or Dua to Jinns, invoking dead ect

Hanafi scholars from 3rd to 6th Century on the Kufr of the one who believes the Prophet (saw) knows the Unseen and takes him as a witness

The Hanafi Mujtahid from the 5th Century, As-Sadr ush-Shaheed Husam ud-Deen, who was the senior teacher of numerous other pillars of the Hanafi Madh-hab, including the famous authors of al-Hidaaya and al-Muheet al-Ridawi, narrates the following ruling from his pious predecessors:

من تزوج امرأة بشهادة الله و رسوله لا يجوز لأنه نكاح لم يحضره الشهود، وحكى عن أبو القاسم الصفار أن هذا كفر محض لأنه اعتقد أن رسول الله يعلم الغيب وهذا كفر

"Whoever marries a woman, taking Allah and his messenger (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as witnesses – it is not permissible because witnesses are not present for the Nikah.

It is related from Abul Qaasim as-Saffaar that this is **Kufr Mahd** (pure, unadulterated disbelief that expels a person from Islam) because he believed that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) **knows the unseen (ghayb) and this is Kufr**." [Al-Waaqi'aat, page 70 of the manuscript]

Imam Abul Qaasim as-Saffaar as-Soofee (326H) was a Hanafi Mujtahid with only three links between himself and Imam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullahi alayh). This fatwa has been accepted and transmitted in every age by the Hanafi Fuqaha.

The very same Fatwa or similar versions to it were accepted and quoted approvingly by the early Fatwa manuals which constituted the Hanafi Madh-hab such as al-Fataawa ul-Walwaalijiyyah (Vol. 5, pg. 422), Khulaasat ul-Fataawa (Vol. 4, pg. 385), al-Muheet ul-Burhaani (Vol. 7, pg. 407), al-Fataawa al-Bazzaaziyyah (Vol. 6, pg. 325), al-Fusool ul-Imaadiyyah, al-Multaqat (pg. 244), Fataawa Qaadhi Khaan (Vol. 2, pg. 517), and other authoritative texts...

The following version is found in the authoritative compendium of the Hanafi Madh-hab, Fataawa ul-Hindiyyah, which was the product of a collaborative effort involving hundreds of Ulama from around the Ummah who were commissioned by Hadhrat Alamghir Aurangzeb (rahmatullah alayh) to record those rulings upon which there is consensus or a general agreement amongst the Hanafi Fuqaha:

"A man marries a woman while witnesses are not present. He says: "I make Allah and His Rasul witness", or he says, "I make Allah and His Angels witness", he becomes Kaafir; **but if he says: "I make the angel on the left shoulder and angel on the right shoulder witness", he does not become a Kaafir**." [Vol. 2 pg. 288]

…

The same version of the Fatwa narrated by Fataawa al-Hindiyyah is found in earlier

compilations such as Khulaasat ul-Fataawa, al-Fusool ul-Imdaadiyyah, Fataawa al-Bazzaaziyah and al-Muheet ul-Burhaani.

Explaining why the one who invokes the two writing angels (Kiraaman Kaatibeen) as witnesses does not become a Kaafir, as opposed to the one who attributes the knowledge of the very same Nikah to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the author of al-Muheet narrates from an earlier Fataawa compilation:

"He does not become Kaafir because those two (i.e. the writing angels in the right and left shoulders) do know that (i.e. the Nikah), **since they are not absent from him (i.e. the man making the statement)**." [Vol. 7, pg. 407]

Taken from Hanafi website Barelwism WordPress

Imam Qurtubi in Surah Jinn on Shirk in Istia'azah (seeking refuge) from Jinn

Imam Qurtubi wrote in his Tafsir of the verse: "**There were men from mankind seeking refuge with men from the jinn, so they increased their burden (Rahaqan)**" (Surah al-Jinn, 6).

"Qatada, Abu Al-Aaliyah, Al-Rabi', and Ibn Zaid all said: Due to this, mankind increased in anxiety and fear of the Jinn. Saeed Ibn Jubayr said: (they increased in) Kufr (disbelief). **It is clear that seeking refuge in the Jinn instead of seeking refuge in Allah (Most High) is Kufr (disbelief) and Shirk (polytheism)**." (Imam al-Qurtubi, al-Jami li Ahkam al-Quran).

As quoted on Hanafi website Islam answers

Imam Qarafi Al-Maliki on Kufr and Shirk of attributing Kun fa Yakun to creation

Imam Ahmad bin Idris Shihab al-Din Qarafi al-Maliki (d. 684H / may Allah have mercy on him) has also refuted those Sufis who assign the power of kun fayakun to the creation.

He writes, "The second type is that a person making du'a (supplication) is extremely stupid and daring, leading him to ask Allah to grant him special powers for running the universe which are exclusively under the power and will of Allah, such as creation, annihilation, and predestination. Common sense and logic indicate that it is impossible for these divine powers to be for anyone besides Allah.

This means that such a request is in fact asking for PARTNERSHIP with Allah in his kingdom and this is akin to **disbelief (kufr)**. Many ignorant Sufis have fallen into this trap and they claim that so-and-so was given the word 'kun' (Be!) and they ask to be given this divine command, which Allah mentions in the Qur'an, '**Our command for a matter when we will it is to say to it 'be' and it becomes**'.

They do not understand the meaning of this phrase in the speech of Allah and they also do not understand the meaning of this divine phrase being 'given' to someone, if that could be possible. This is a matter that is impossible to achieve according to the qualified scholars, let alone the concocting Sufis. This causes these Sufis to be destroyed in a way

that they do not even realize. They believe that they are among those close to Allah, when in reality they are far from Him. May Allah save us from evil trials and those things that lead up to them. May Allah save us from ignorance and that which leads to it." (Anwar al-Buruq fi Anwa' al-Furuq, 4:446)

From Hanafi website barelwism WordPress

Qadhi Ibnul Arabi Al-Maliki on the Kufr of the one who claims the faculty to know whatever will happen tomorrow

In his Tafsir "Ahkam Al-Quran", Surah Al-An'am, verse 59, Qadhi Abu Bakr ibnul Arabi Al-Maliki clearly affirmed the Kufr of the one who claims to know whatever will occur tomorrow. He said:

"As for the one who claims to have the knowledge of earnings in the life's future, **he is a Kafir** or he informs about the beings in general or in details regarding what is to occur before it occurs, **then there is no doubt about is Kufr also**.

As for the one who informs about the solar or lunar eclipse, then our scholars said: He is punished and imprisoned and does not become Kafir. As for the absence of Takfir, this is because a group said that it is a matter that can be reached through calculation and estimating the phases as Allah (Subhanahu wa Ta'ala) informed: "**As for the moon, We have ordained ˹precise˺ phases for it**" (Yasin: 39)

So because of their calculation and informing about it and their truthfulness in it, the scholars withheld from doing Takfir of them.

As for punishing them, it is because they bring doubt to the laymen about fixing the knowledge of the unseen that is to occur, and they (laymen) would not know the difference between this and other than it, so their beliefs in the religion will be confused and their rules regarding certainty will shake, so they (those who estimate) are punished until they keep it secret if they know and do not make it public" End of Qadhi ibnul Arabi's words

Comments: We can see how severe the Maliki scholars were in punishing those who estimate moon phases to tell when Solar or Lunar eclipses might occur, to protect the beliefs of the laymen, and we have people saying that the Imams or saints controlling all atoms of the universe and knowing everything in the universe and watching the whole universe at all time is not Kufr. Rather extreme Sufis like Dabbagh claim that saints not only watch permanently the universe but also decide of what is to occur tomorrow, and they also have fairy tales of saints fighting when they differ of what is to occur tomorrow as in "Al-Ibriz" of Dabbagh and these supposed saints kill each other. The book "Al-Ibriz" of Dabbagh which also claims saints watch husband and wife in bed, is respected by Ahmad Raza Khan and Muhammad ibn Alawi Al-Maliki who quote from it.

As for some matters being disclosed by Karamat and Kashf, these are matters breaking natural laws that Allah produces on some instances like Allah (Ta'ala) made Umar see event of Saariyah in another land and He (ta'ala) made Saariyah to hear Umar. These are

not faculties granted to the human being as we have the faculty to speak, see and hear, rather actions done by Allah for saints. These are speculative matters as person does not know if such are Karamat or satanic tricks and these are not permanent powers or faculties as Umar did not see his killer and other events: for details see scholars explanation of Wasitiyah of Shaykhul Islam ibn Taymiyah in article in Magazine Ahl e Hadith 5 on Karamat and Mukashafah: https://umm-ul-qura.org/2025/03/31/magazine-ahl-e-hadith-5/

As for the one who claims to have the power or faculty to know whatever will occur tomorrow, the Maliki scholars as claimed by Qadhi ibnul Arabi are declaring him a Kafir without any doubt.

Qadhi Iyadh Al-Maliki on what only Allah can do

Qadhi Iyadh write in "Ash-Shifa", chapter: The Miracles and Karamat of the Prophet (Pages 137-138 of English Translation by Aisha Bewly), Section 3: The meaning of miracles (mu'jizat):

"The other sort is things that are beyond their power and which **they cannot do** - such as bringing the dead to life, turning a staff into a snake, bringing the shecamel out of the rock, the tree speaking, water flowing from between the fingers, and splitting the moon. **ONLY ALLAH CAN DO THESE THINGS**. They are things that Allah does at the hand of one of His Prophets. The Prophet's challenge to those who denied him to produce something similar was in order to show their incapacity."

Ibn Aqeel Al-Hanbali and ibn Jawzi on grave worship

Shaykh Salih Aal Shaykh quoted in "These are our Notions" p 60 of the English translation published by Umm-ul-Qura Publications, in reply to Muhammad ibn Alawi Maliki:

ibn 'Aqeel Al-Hambali, who said: "When the religious duties became difficult for the ignorant people and the transgressors, they turned away from the legislated places of worship and started to venerate places that they fabricated for themselves, and this was easier for them because the matter was not on the authority of others. **And these people are disbelievers for me because of these places, because of the veneration of graves, addressing the dead people for the fulfilment of their needs**, writing on talismans: 'O my master, do such-and-such for me', and putting clothes on trees in imitation of those who worshiped Al-Lat and Al-'Uzza."

(This is mentioned by Ibn Al-Jawzi at the end of his book "Talbis Iblis" and ibn Al-Qayim in "Ighathat Al-Lahfan")

Ustadh Bassam Zawadi showing classical ancient Hanafi texts about slaughtering out of respect for rulers

Ustadh Basam wrote in his blog (https://islamicdiscourse.substack.com/) :

Below is a partial translation of a telegram post written by Ustadh Alaa' Hasan.

We present to you the opinion of Ḥanafī jurists regarding the act of slaughtering for living beings as an expression of veneration so that you may understand the scholars' disavowal of what the Qubūriyyah (i.e., those who venerate the dead) have attributed to them concerning the issue of vows.

The Ḥanafī school holds that slaughtering for the sake of living beings is prohibited if there is an indication of veneration. One such indication is when an animal is slaughtered upon the arrival of a guest or a ruler, and the meat is distributed among people without the guest himself partaking in it. In such a case, they considered it slaughtering for other than Allah, as withholding the meat from the guest suggests that the act was performed as an expression of veneration toward him.

Al-Ḥaṣkafī al-Ḥanafī states:

إن قدمها ليأكل منها كان الذبح لله، والمنفعة للضيف أو للوليمة أو للربح، وإن لم يقدمها ليأكل منها، بل دفعها لغيره كان لتعظيم غير الله، فتحرم، وهل يكفر؟ قولان

"If he offers it so that the guest may eat from it, then the slaughter is for Allah, while the benefit is for the guest, the banquet, or profit. However, if he does not offer it for the guest to eat but instead gives it to others, then it is considered an act of veneration for other than Allah, and it is prohibited. As for whether this constitutes disbelief, there are two opinions."

He has transmitted two opinions regarding whether this constitutes disbelief In Naẓm al-Wahbāniyyah, titled Qayd al-Sharāʾid, concerning one who slaughters for a guest out of veneration, the author attributes the view that it constitutes disbelief to the majority. He states:

وفاعله جمهورهم قال: يكفرُ وفضلي وإسماعيل ليس يكفرُ

"The majority have said that the doer of this act is deemed a disbeliever, while Faḍlī and Ismāʿīl do not consider him a disbeliever."

قلت : فنقل عن الجمهور الكفر، ونقل عن عالمين فقط عدم الكفر، فتأمل.

Thus, he attributed the ruling of disbelief to the majority and the opposing opinion to only two scholars. Reflect on this.

Ibn Qāsim al-ʿAbbādī al-Ḥanafī states:

الذبح عند مرأى الضيف تعظيمًا له، لا يحل أكلها، وكذا عند قدوم الأمير أو غيره؛ تعظيمًا؛ لأنه أُهل لغير الله

“Slaughtering in the presence of a guest as an act of veneration renders the meat impermissible to consume, and the same ruling applies when slaughtering upon the arrival of a ruler or any other person as an expression of veneration, for it has been dedicated to other than Allah.”

What has been previously stated clarifies the Ḥanafī position regarding those who slaughter for the living in ordinary circumstances, such as banquets and similar occasions. Despite this, they ruled that if there was an indication that the act of slaughtering was performed as an expression of veneration, it would be considered something dedicated to other than Allah. How, then, could it be assumed that the jurists permitted slaughtering for the dead?!
Benefits of These Citations:

The refutation of the Qubūriyyah’s claim that the jurists were lenient in allowing acts of worship to be directed to other than Allah. If this was their level of caution regarding slaughtering for the living—where veneration does not reach the level of worship—then what about other cases?

The Salafis were not as strict regarding slaughtering for the living; rather, they permitted it without restriction. This is because veneration exists in degrees, and honoring the living is customary. Even if an animal is slaughtered to venerate (or show reverence to) a ruler upon his arrival, such reverence does not amount to worship.

This demonstrates the balanced nature of the Salafi perspective, contrary to the claims propagated by some.

The jurists did not require a belief in lordship (rubūbiyyah)—as seen in the previous citations—but rather classified such a vow as something dedicated to other than Allah based merely on a distant indication of veneration. They also reported two opinions regarding whether the individual is deemed a disbeliever. Had the criterion been the belief in lordship, they would not have differed regarding his disbelief. Reflect on this carefully